



1991
File Room

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION 5
230 SOUTH DEARBORN STREET
CHICAGO, IL 60604

JAN 1992

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:
R-19J

Ms. Mary Gade
Director
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
2200 Churchill Road
P.O. Box 19296
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Dear Ms. Gade:

On November 13-15, 1991, the end-of-year evaluation of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's (IEPA) Underground Injection Control (UIC) program was conducted by USEPA Region 5. The purpose of the evaluation was to conduct the routine end-of-year review of the progress made in the regulation of Class I, IV and V wells during Fiscal Year (FY) 1991.

The Region is pleased with the great strides IEPA has made during FY 1991, especially with regard to the Class V program. IEPA conducted 104 inspections of facilities that were identified by USEPA as possibly having a service station bay well or industrial wastewater disposal well. Seventeen facilities were determined to either definitely have Class V wells, or as requiring further assessment before a decision can be made.

We are also pleased with the progress made on the service station bay (5X28) video. Although the deadline for the video's completion had to be pushed back considerably, necessitating a budget/project period extension, we believe IEPA will have a useful, high quality product from this venture. We encourage IEPA to continue to pursue avenues for distribution of this video, such as trade associations, public-access television, other agencies within the State, other states, as well as USEPA. Again, we strongly support IEPA's efforts in the Class V program, and we are hopeful that these activities are the beginning of an active, viable program in Illinois.

The Region also remains pleased with the work done in Class I permitting. To date, permit determinations have been made for all eight Class I wells in Illinois. In addition, two Class I non-hazardous permits are expected to be terminated in the near



future. As soon as IEPA verifies that the wells are no longer receiving Class I wastes, the Class I permits will be terminated and these facilities will be under the control of the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals. In addition, the Allied-Signal Inc.'s Class I permit expired this year and IEPA has developed a preliminary draft of the new permit. Region 5 is pleased to note that the permit incorporates a new, stricter standard for mechanical integrity testing, resulting in increased protection of ground water resources.

In general, the Region is pleased with the compliance and enforcement activities conducted at IEPA. During previous reviews, Region 5 expressed concern about the timeliness of compliance monitoring reviews, as well as IEPA's ability to deal with cases of repeated and/or continued non-compliance. While IEPA has made significant progress during the past year to resolve these problems, the Region remains concerned that monthly monitoring reports may not have been reviewed in a timely manner.

While the Region found that monthly monitoring reports are being reviewed by field inspectors, some inspectors are only reviewing the forms immediately before they conduct an inspection of the facility (every 3 - 12 months), rather than on a monthly basis. It is essential that field inspectors review these reports in a timely manner. A review of these documents only on a quarterly or annual basis could result in potentially dangerous situations going unaddressed for extended periods of time.

With regard to IEPA's ability to address cases of continued and/or repeated non-compliance, it appears that IEPA has begun to address this problem, as well. During FY 1991, five Compliance Inquiry Letters (CILs) were issued. Two of the CILs have already been resolved, and IEPA is continuing to work with the remaining companies to resolve these cases. One case the Region is following closely is the Cabot case which is discussed below.

IEPA staff identified 36 permit violations when they inspected Cabot's deepwell facility earlier this year. Two CILs were issued to Cabot, neither of which have been resolved to date. IEPA indicated during our review that the Cabot case would be forwarded to their Enforcement Decision Group for possible litigation referral. Region 5 will monitor future enforcement activities and will consider the possibility of a primary enforcement action against Cabot if the matter is not resolved.

IEPA expects to make another attempt this spring to enact legislation giving them Administrative Order (AO) authority. We strongly encourage IEPA to continue pursuance of AO authority and we will fully support IEPA's efforts. In the absence of such authority, Region 5 still welcomes any IEPA referrals to the USEPA of repeat violators, or cases which the State is unable to take timely action on.

A copy of the FY 1991 end-of-year evaluation report is enclosed. In summary, the Region is encouraged by progress made in the UIC program. We are especially pleased with the level of effort dedicated to the Class V area, and we look forward to working with IEPA on developing an even stronger shallow injection well program. If you have any questions or comments regarding this evaluation, please contact Laura Flynn, of my staff, at (312) 886-2929.

/s/ original signed by
Valdas V. Adamkus

cc: William Child, IEPA
Thomas Cavanagh, IEPA

1/8

bcc: John Taylor
George Hudak
Dave Werbach
Ray Urchel
Lisa Perenchio
Valoria Robinson
Jerri-Anne Garl, GWPB

**ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL (UIC) PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 1991
END-OF-YEAR EVALUATION**

INTRODUCTION

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) received primacy on February 1, 1984, to administer the State's Underground Injection Control (UIC) program for Class I, III, IV, and V wells. IEPA regulates a universe of eight active Class I wells, five of which inject hazardous waste, and approximately 1,900 shallow injection wells (Class V wells) identified to date. There have been no Class III wells identified in the State and there are no known Class IV wells. Regulation of injection wells is the responsibility of the Division of Land Pollution Control (DLPC) of IEPA.

On November 13-15, 1991, representatives from USEPA-Region 5 conducted the FY 1991 end-of-year evaluation of IEPA's UIC program. The evaluation included a review of IEPA files and discussions with IEPA staff. In-depth discussions were held concerning the progress of the shallow injection well (Class V) program. In addition, the FY 1991 end-of-year evaluation placed emphasis on the following activities:

- Program Administration
- Class I Permitting
- Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Actions
- Data Management
- Program Coordination

In addition, during the evaluation, discussions were held with representatives from IEPA's Public Water Supplies and Ground Water programs, and subsequent to the evaluation, a meeting was also held with representatives from the Illinois Department of Public Health. The purpose of both meetings was to discuss areas of overlap in the Class V program, and to explore the development and implementation of activities which will provide increased protection of groundwater. The Region is pleased that the DLPC was able to arrange these discussions, and we view this as a significant step toward increased cooperation between programs. We encourage the DLPC to continue to maintain and foster these lines of communication.

The participants in the FY 1991 end-of-year evaluation and subsequent meeting are listed below.

Participants

Region 5:	John Taylor	Laura Flynn
	George Hudak	Dave Werbach
	Ray Urchel	Lisa Perenchio
	Valoria Robinson	

IEPA:	Bill Child	Bill Radlinski
	Tom Cavanagh	Ron Steward
	Jill Withers	Glenn Savage
	Rick Cobb	Anthony Dulka
	Dave McMillan	Lynn Dunaway

Illinois Department of Public Health:

Clint Mudgett	Dave Antonacci
---------------	----------------

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Program Administration

Regulation of injection wells is the responsibility of the Division of Land Pollution Control of the IEPA. During Fiscal Year (FY) 1991, 2.2 workyears were committed to the implementation of the 1422 program in Illinois for a total budget of \$182,783. USEPA continues to support IEPA's UIC program with 75% funding.

The Region was especially pleased that IEPA was able to fulfill almost all FY 1991 workplan commitments, resulting in unexpended funds of less than \$5,000. Prior to FY 1991, IEPA left an average of \$70,000 per year unexpended, and was often unable to meet workplan commitments, especially in the Class V program. In order to be consistent with National priorities, it was necessary for IEPA to review its available resources, and shift resources to Class V for FY 1991. We are pleased with IEPA's overall level of effort in FY 1991, and with the tremendous increase in Class V activities. An in-depth discussion of IEPA's Class V activities is discussed in a separate section below.

Of concern to the Region, however, is IEPA's grant status for FY 1992. To date, IEPA has not submitted a grant application for FY 1992 funding, although the deadline for submission was September 30, 1991. Through discussions with IEPA DLPC management, the Region found that the status of the UIC grant application is being reviewed by upper management and several alternatives are being explored. It is important to note, however, that as the grant application was not submitted by September 30, 1991, the award may be reduced from the amount previously committed to IEPA.

In light of the significant progress made in the UIC program during FY 1991, we encourage IEPA to continue with Primary Enforcement Authority for the entire 1422 program and submit a grant application as quickly as possible. Recognizing the financial constraints of maintaining a strong program, the Region will continue to work with IEPA to develop innovative ways of managing the program. One possibility under review by the Region is a limited referral of cases to USEPA for primary enforcement actions to supplement the State's enforcement program. Another option is to utilize existing field personnel in the Solid Waste program to conduct follow-up inspections of identified Class V facilities. We will also work with the DLPC to identify additional ways in which UIC activities can be augmented by other local, State and Federal programs.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. The Region was pleased that IEPA was able to fulfill almost all FY 1991 workplan commitments, especially with regard to the Class V program.

2. We are, however, concerned about the status of IEPA's FY 1992 grant application and workplan. To date, IEPA has not submitted a grant application, although the deadline for funding was September 30, 1991. It is important to note, however, that as the grant application was not submitted by September 30, 1991, the award may be reduced from the amount previously committed to IEPA.
3. In light of the significant progress made in the UIC program during FY 1991, we encourage IEPA to continue with Primary Enforcement Authority for the 1422 program, and to submit an approvable grant application as quickly as possible.

Class I Permitting

The Region remains pleased with the work done in Class I permitting and with the high level of cooperation received from IEPA in this area. To date, permit determinations have been made for all Class I wells in Illinois. IEPA regulates a universe of eight active Class I wells in Illinois. However, one of these wells, the Velsicol #2 well, is currently under authorization by rule. In addition, two Class I non-hazardous permits are expected to be terminated in the near future. Natural Gas Pipe Line (NGPL)-Herscher and NGPL-St. Elmo, have received Class II permits from the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals (IDMM). As soon as IEPA verifies that the wells are no longer receiving Class I wastes, the Class I permits will be terminated and these facilities will be under the control of IDMM.

USEPA technical reviewers examined the four most recent permit actions performed by IEPA. These included the permit reissuance for Allied, the permit modification for LTV, and the permit cancellation for NGPL-St. Elmo and NGPL-Herscher. These actions are discussed below.

Allied-Signal

The Allied-Signal Inc.'s (Allied) Class I injection well permit expired this year. IEPA has developed a preliminary draft of the new permit. This draft incorporates the new standard for mechanical integrity of no more than a 3 percent pressure loss over 60 minutes, rather than over 30 minutes as was specified in the previous permit. This new, stricter standard makes the Allied permit consistent with the other Class I permits in Illinois in this regard, and will result in increased protection to ground water resources.

The Region 5 staff have performed an initial review of the preliminary draft, and expect to see a final draft in the near future. We will keep in close contact with IEPA technical staff to ensure that an acceptable permit is issued to Allied.

Allied has also requested that their existing land ban petition be modified to include several new waste codes which were not in the original exemption. The USEPA is working on this request and will coordinate closely with IEPA staff on this effort.

Natural Gas Pipeline Company (NGPL)

The NGPL Company has asked to have their Class I injection well permits terminated for injection wells at their plants in St. Elmo and Herscher. These facilities store natural gas in underground rock formations and the injection wells will be used only for the disposal of fluids brought to the surface when the gas is produced. Previously, these fluids had been mixed with other fluids from the associated gas processing plants at these facilities, and some of these fluids were such that the injection wells were classified as nonhazardous, Class I injection wells.

NGPL has now diverted these extraneous wastestreams and the injectate is to consist only of approved, Class II fluids. NGPL has already received Class II permits from the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals (IDMM), and, as soon as the Class I permits are terminated, the wells will be removed from the IEPA Class I well inventory and will be solely under the control of the IDMM.

LTV Steel:

The LTV Steel Co. permit is being modified to include requirements for groundwater monitoring. These requirements were made a part of the land ban petition approved in June 1990, and the specific points were negotiated with LTV and IEPA since then. Region 5 has made a preliminary evaluation of the groundwater monitoring plan, and will continue to review the plan in the immediate future. If the Region has any comments, they will be provided to IEPA before the end of the public comment period.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. Region 5 remains pleased with the work done by IEPA in the area of Class I permitting, and with the high level of cooperation received from IEPA on Class I related activities. To date, permit determinations have been made for all eight Class I wells in Illinois.

2. The Allied-Signal Inc.'s Class I permit expired this year and IEPA has developed a preliminary draft of the new permit. Region 5 is pleased to note that the permit incorporates a new, stricter standard for mechanical integrity testing, resulting in increased protection of ground water resources.
3. In addition, two Class I non-hazardous permits are expected to be terminated in the near future. As soon as IEPA verifies that the wells are no longer receiving Class I wastes, the Class I permits will be terminated and these facilities will be under the control of the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals.
4. The LTV permit is being modified to include requirements for groundwater monitoring. Region 5 has made a preliminary evaluation of the ground water monitoring plan, and will continue to review the plan in the immediate future.

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Actions

In general, Region 5 is pleased with the compliance and enforcement activities being conducted by IEPA. During previous reviews, Region 5 expressed concern about compliance monitoring and enforcement at IEPA. During this review, the Region was pleased to find that IEPA has made good progress during the past year to resolve problems in these areas. However, we remain concerned about the timeliness of compliance monitoring reviews. This issue is discussed in detail below.

Compliance Monitoring

During FY 1991, the individual responsible for reviewing compliance monitoring reports transferred to another section. To address this change, IEPA developed a new procedure for reviewing the reports. This new procedure resulted in the primary responsibility for review shifting from the Springfield office to the regional field inspectors. At the time of the mid-year review, this procedure had been only partially implemented. At that time, the Region was concerned that these reports may not have been reviewed in a timely manner.

Prior to the FY 1991 EOY review, Region 5 contacted several field inspectors to discuss the implementation of the new review procedures. During these discussions, Region 5 found that the reports were being reviewed by the field inspectors. However, most of the inspectors were reviewing the reports immediately before the quarterly or annual inspection, rather than monthly. When this was brought to the attention of IEPA management, they agreed to notify each

field office regarding the proper procedures for reviewing monthly compliance reports. The Region will review this issue again during the FY 1992 mid-year review to ensure that procedures are being properly implemented.

The Region considers it essential that each field inspector review the monthly monitoring reports for the facilities in their region on a monthly basis. This will allow IEPA to identify, prepare and execute CILs or other enforcement tools in a timely manner. A review of these documents every 3 or 6 months, or longer, could result in potentially dangerous situations going unaddressed for extended periods of time. We encourage DLPC management to work with the field staff to ensure that all review procedures are correctly implemented.

Continued and/or Repeated Non-Compliance

IEPA's ability to address cases of continued and/or repeated non-compliance has been raised as a concern during the last two reviews. It appears that IEPA has begun to address this problem. During FY 1991, five CILs were issued: two each to Cabot Corporation and Allied Signal and one to Natural Gas Pipeline. Allied Signal complied with its CILs on December 20, 1990, and June 20, 1991. The other cases have not been resolved yet, however, IEPA is continuing to work with the companies and Region 5 to resolve these cases. The Region is especially interested in the Cabot case which is discussed below.

Cabot Corporation

IEPA staff identified 36 permit violations when it inspected Cabot's deepwell injection facility earlier this year. The violations included operating, maintenance and reporting violations. During FY 1991, the State issued two CILs to Cabot, the first in October 1990, and the most recent on September 17, 1991. Some of the violations cited include: continued operations of a well after Cabot staff were aware of an operating failure with the annulus, failure to report violations within 24 hours, failure to properly sample the wells, problems with the operation of recording devices and the submission of illegible report to IEPA by the company.

The CILs resulted in ongoing negotiations by Cabot and IEPA. In addition, Cabot notified IEPA on June 4, 1991, that they had voluntarily ceased injection on Well #1. IEPA indicated during our review that the Cabot case would be forwarded in late December to their Enforcement Decision Group (EDG), a pre-screening process for possible litigation.

EDG meetings are held monthly to discuss enforcement issues. Participants include senior IEPA officials, attorneys, and staff who have prepared possible enforcement actions for the EDG to consider that month. The IEPA staffer

handling the case writes a memo detailing the specifics of the case. If the EDG chooses to file an enforcement action, an Enforcement Notice Letter is issued to the operator by the DLPC manager. Cases can then be referred by the EDG to the Illinois Attorney General, a County State's Attorney, or Region 5.

Cabot is expected to respond to the CILs in early December. Region 5 will monitor future enforcement activities and will consider the possibility of a primary enforcement action against Cabot if the matter is not resolved. Any action pursued by IEPA and Cabot must include a compliance schedule for correcting the permit violations, and Well #1 must either be plugged or continue to cease injection until the well is able to maintain mechanical integrity. In addition, Cabot officials are apparently discussing the possibility of constructing a new well and plugging Well #1. Region 5 will also monitor these plans as they progress.

Administrative Order Authority

IEPA expects to make another attempt this spring to enact legislation giving it Administrative Order (AO) authority. The most recent attempt to obtain AO authority, never made it out of the Bureau of the Budget office. We strongly encourage IEPA to continue pursuance of AO authority and we will fully support IEPA in these efforts. In the absence of such authority, Region 5 still welcomes any IEPA referrals to the USEPA of repeat violators, or cases which the State is unable to take timely action on.

Compliance and Enforcement Strategies

During the mid-year review, Region 5 discussed the need to update the IEPA compliance and enforcement strategies. Since that time, IEPA submitted a copy of its Compliance/Enforcement Management System (CMES), a RCRA oriented strategy document, for review by the Region. Apparently, Region 5's comments were never received by IEPA, and they have agreed to send another copy of the CMES to Region 5 so that it can be reviewed in detail again.

In general, we feel the CMES will serve as an excellent basis or model for the UIC compliance strategy. However, the document needs to be tailored to reflect the specifics of the UIC program. Simply stating that "the system we use in RCRA is the same system we use in UIC," does not constitute an adequate UIC strategy. The compliance strategy should serve to document, in detail, the procedures that the UIC staff use in all aspects of their compliance/enforcement program.

The enforcement strategy should identify IEPA's short-term enforcement priorities for the current year. Through our discussions with IEPA staff, it became evident

that IEPA has already identified their priorities for FY 1992, i.e., follow-up on high priority Class V sites and continued compliance monitoring of Class I sites, however, this needs to be documented in an enforcement strategy for FY 1992.

While the compliance strategy should be a "stand alone" document which can be used to describe all compliance/enforcement related procedures, the enforcement strategy could be an attachment to the FY 1992 grant application and workplan. We also expect that the compliance strategy would be updated periodically as procedures change, while the enforcement strategy should be updated annually to reflect the current year's enforcement priorities.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Compliance of Class I facilities is hand-tracked on forms, rather than on a computer system, by the Planning and Reporting Section's Compliance Tracking Unit. During previous reviews, Region 5 had difficulty locating some compliance related documents which appeared to be either misfiled or unfiled. During the FY 1991 EOY review, however, the files we reviewed appeared to be organized. We encourage IEPA to continue on ensuring that all documents are filed in the appropriate files in a timely manner.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. In general, Region 5 is pleased with the compliance and enforcement activities being conducted by IEPA. The Region was pleased to find that IEPA has made good progress during the past year to resolve problems in these areas.
2. The Region, however, remains concerned about the timeliness of compliance monitoring reviews. We consider it essential that each field inspector review the monthly monitoring reports for his/her region on a monthly basis. A review of these documents every few months, could result in potentially dangerous situations going unaddressed for extended periods of time.
3. IEPA appears to have begun address cases of continued and/or repeated non-compliance. During FY 1991, five CILs were issued, two of which were resolved, and three of which are still under negotiation.
4. IEPA staff identified 36 permit violations when it inspected Cabot's deepwell facility earlier this year, both of which resulted in on-going negotiations between Cabot and IEPA. IEPA indicated that this case would be referred to

their Enforcement Decision Group, a pre-screening process for possible litigation.

5. IEPA expects to make another attempt at AO authority this spring. We encourage IEPA to continue pursuance of this authority, and we will fully support IEPA's efforts. In the absence of AO authority, Region 5 still welcomes any IEPA referrals to the USEPA.
6. IEPA still needs to update its compliance and enforcement strategies. While the CMES will serve as a good basis for the compliance strategy, this documents need to be tailored to reflect the specifics of the UIC program. The enforcement strategy should identify IEPA's short-term enforcement priorities for the current year, and could be an attachment to the grant application and workplan.
7. IEPA has made good progress in organizing the Class I files. We encourage IEPA to continue ensuring that all documents are file in the appropriate files in a timely manner.

Class V Program

The original FY 1991 grant application provided for only 0.2 workyears in the Class V program. After considerable negotiation between IEPA and Region 5, IEPA submitted an approvable grant application in March 1991, which increased the level of effort in this area to 0.86 workyears. While the Region strongly supports the increased effort in the FY 1991 Class V program, IEPA must continue to direct resources toward the Class V effort.

The Class V program could also be greatly enhanced without significantly increasing resources, by improving coordination between all of the State's ground water related programs, those within IEPA as well as with other State programs. IEPA has already made some progress in identifying key ground water related programs, and we encourage IEPA to continue to pursue these types of activities.

Other Class V activities for FY 1991, included the development of an instructional video on Service Station Bay (5X28) wells, inspections of the 5X28 wells on the State inventory and a supplemental list provided by USEPA, and updating the Class V inventory with any Class V wells found within "setback zones" by the Division of Public Water Supplies.

The Region was especially pleased with the level of effort directed towards the inspection of potential "high priority" Class V injection well sites. We are also

pleased with the progress on the 5X28 video. These, and the other proposed Class V activities and their current status is discussed below. Again, we strongly support IEPA's efforts in the Class V program, and we are hopeful that these activities are the beginning of an active, viable program in Illinois.

Class V Coordination

During the FY 1991 EOY review, IEPA arranged to have several representatives from the newly reorganized Water Division, as well as representatives from the Illinois Department of Public Health, meet with DLPC staff and Region 5 reviewers. Areas of overlap were discussed, as well as activities which could mutually benefit each other's programs.

Contaminant source identification projects were one area of overlap identified during the discussions. Class V source ID projects, "setback zone" reviews, vulnerability assessments and hazard reviews all serve to identify potential routes of contamination to ground water. By modifying the inventory portion of these projects, a single inventory could serve the purposes of more than one program. This would avoid duplication of effort and save resources as well.

Region 5 Drinking Water, UIC, and Ground Water (DUG) programs have recently conducted a similar activity. The DUG workgroup completed a Position Paper which identified areas of overlap and activities which can mutually benefit one another's programs. The group is looking into the possibility of developing a comprehensive contaminant source identification program which would meet the objectives of the Class V inventory, wellhead protection survey, and Drinking Water vulnerability assessments.

Although we recognize that not every inventory will meet each program's goals, in those cases where a single inventory could be conducted, this would save considerable time, effort, and resources, while also saving the State and local community from duplicitous paperwork. We encourage IEPA to continue building these ties with other ground water related programs so that the State can also achieve greater benefit from its resources. If requested, Region 5 will work with IEPA to establish these ties.

Investigation of 5X28 Wells

Although no Class V inspections were reported on IEPA's quarterly reporting forms, Region 5 was pleased to find that IEPA had actually conducted 104 inspections of potential "high priority" Class V facilities. Of these 104 facilities, 17 were found to either definitely have a Class V well, or were identified as needing further assessment before a determination could be made.

After agreement has been reached on the FY 1992 grant application, IEPA plans to further evaluate these 17 facilities to determine what, if any, follow-up actions will be necessary. Region 5 will continue to work closely with IEPA to ensure that each facility is adequately addressed. If requested, Region 5 is also willing to take primary enforcement action in any case that IEPA feels would be best addressed through federal mechanisms.

In addition, inventory information will be available shortly from the 5X28 National AO. As part of this National AO, several major oil companies are providing USEPA with inventory information for all facilities which are either leased from, or affiliated with, by these companies. IEPA may also want to consider some of the facilities from this inventory for possible follow-up inspections.

Public Education/Pollution Prevention

We are also pleased with the progress made on the service station bay (5X28) video. Although the deadline for the video's completion had to be pushed back considerably, necessitating a budget/project period extension, we believe IEPA will have a useful, high quality product from this venture. We encourage IEPA to continue to pursue avenues for distribution of this video, such as trade associations, public-access television, other agencies within the State, other states, as well as USEPA. During FY 1992, the Region will continue to monitor distribution efforts by IEPA.

McHenry County Source ID Project

IEPA reduced their original FY 1991 budget by \$15,000 so that Region 5 could issue a grant to the McHenry County Defenders (Defenders) for source identification work in McHenry County, Illinois. The Region had previously attempted to encourage IEPA to sponsor a source identification project in the county, however, IEPA felt they could not commit resources toward the project at this time. IEPA requested to be kept informed of this joint USEPA/McHenry County Defenders effort.

To date, the Defenders have recruited volunteers for Phase I of their project, a drive-by inventory of stormwater drainage wells in Crystal Lake and Cary, Illinois. They have also formed a citizens' committee to address ground water related concerns in the County. The Defenders have asked Region 5 and IEPA to sit on the committee as "honorary members." Region 5 will participate in the committee, and we encourage IEPA to participate, as well. In discussions with IEPA management, there was some support for having the Regional field inspector sit on the committee, and we encourage IEPA to follow through on this suggestion.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. The Region is pleased with the great strides IEPA has made during FY 1991, with regard to the Class V program. IEPA conducted 104 inspections of facilities that were identified as possibly having a service station bay well or industrial wastewater disposal well. Seventeen facilities were determined to either definitely have Class V wells, or as requiring further assessment before a decision can be made.
2. We are also pleased with the progress made on the service station bay (5X28) video. Although the deadline for the video's completion had to be pushed back considerably, necessitating a budget/project period extension, we believe IEPA will have a useful, high quality product from this venture. We encourage IEPA to continue to pursue avenues for distribution of this video, such as trade associations, public-access television, other agencies within the State, other states, as well as USEPA.
3. We strongly support IEPA's efforts in the Class V program, and we are hopeful that these activities are the beginning of an active, viable program in Illinois.

Ms. Mary Gade
Director
Illinois Environmental Protection
Agency
2200 Churchill Road
P.O. Box 19296
Springfield, Illinois 62794-9276

Dear Ms. Gade:

On April 22-25, 1991, the mid-year evaluation of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's (IEPA) Underground Injection Control (UIC) program was conducted by USEPA Region V. Subsequent to the Springfield visit, Region V staff also met on May 24, 1991, with IEPA field staff at the Maywood, Illinois office and spoke by phone with representatives from other field offices. The purpose of the evaluation was to conduct the routine mid-year review of the progress made in the regulation of Class I, III, IV and V wells during Fiscal Year (FY) 1991.

The Region remains pleased with the work done in Class I permitting and with the high level of cooperation received from IEPA in this area. To date, permit determinations have been made for all eight Class I wells in Illinois. The Region notes that the IEPA is changing the pressure testing parameters for mechanical integrity testing and we view this as a positive step toward increased protection of Underground Sources of Drinking Water (USDWs). One permit, the Allied Class I, is due to expire this year. Allied is also requesting a revision to their land ban petition and the Region will work closely with the IEPA in evaluating this request.

IEPA's compliance and enforcement programs, however, remain of concern to the Region. The Region had previously expressed concern that monthly monitoring reports may not be properly reviewed within an adequate timeframe. Reviewers found that since the FY 1990 end-of-year review, apparently only one Compliance Inquiry Letter (CIL) has been issued, and it appears that there may have been a gap in compliance monitoring since that time.

Although a new procedure has been developed for reviewing compliance, it has not been fully implemented to date. The Region views the proposed procedures, if implemented as planned, as strengthening the compliance program and having a positive impact on the protection of USDWs. However, the IEPA must begin full implementation, if the IEPA is to have a comprehensive compliance monitoring program. The IEPA must also ensure that until the system is fully

operational, monthly monitoring reports are reviewed in a timely manner and that enforcement actions are taken as necessary.

The IEPA also needs to ensure that UIC related documents are filed in the appropriate files. Although the UIC filing system continues to show improvement, some compliance related documents still appear to be misfiled. Reviewers also noted a backlog of documents waiting to be screened and filed. The IEPA must ensure that these documents are also screened and filed in a timely manner.

During FY 1991, the Region was asked to provide comments on the IEPA's draft Administrative Order (AO) package which is before the Illinois Legislature. The Region appreciates having the opportunity to comment on this proposal and fully supports the IEPA's attempt to obtain AO authority. In the absence of such authority, Region V still welcomes any IEPA referrals to the USEPA of repeat violators or other cases which the State is unable to take timely action on.

Region V also discussed the need to update the IEPA compliance and enforcement strategies. Many changes have taken place since the IEPA was delegated primacy and in order to more effectively address violations with graduated, escalating enforcement responses, the IEPA needs to update their long-term compliance and enforcement strategies. The IEPA should include a discussion of FY 1992 enforcement priorities in their FY 1992 grant application and workplan.

With regard to the Class V program, the original FY 1991 grant application provided for only 0.2 workyears for Class V activities. After considerable negotiation between the IEPA and Region V, the IEPA submitted an approvable grant application in March 1991, which increased the level of effort in this area to 0.86 workyears. While the Region strongly supports the increased effort in the FY 1991 Class V program, the IEPA must consider shifting even greater resources toward the Class V effort. Although the FY 1991 workplan provided for an increase in Class V workyears over that included in previous fiscal years, even greater involvement by IEPA staff is recommended in future fiscal years so that the Class V program can become more protective of human health and the environment, protect USDWs from possible endangerment, and also to obtain consistency with the National program.

Because the FY 1991 grant was not issued until April 23, 1991, many of the proposed Class V activities had not been implemented as of the FY 1991 mid-year review. Those activities not yet implemented will be reviewed in detail during the FY 1991 end-of-year review. Proposed activities include the development of an instructional video on service station bay (5X28) wells, inspection of the 5X28 wells on the State inventory, and updating the Class V inventory with any Class V wells found within "setback zones" by the Division of Public Water Supplies.

Due to the overlap among Divisions at the IEPA with regard to the Class V program, it is important that the Division of Land Pollution Control (DLPC) remain informed of all Class V activities conducted by the other Divisions, as well as by DLPC field staff. Subsequent to the FY 1991 mid-year review, the

Region found that a number of Class V activities have taken place which were not documented in either the quarterly reports or the annual Class V ad hoc report to the Region. Even if inspections are funded by a program other than the UIC program, such as the Division of Public Water Supplies (DPWS) or the Division of Water Pollution Control, coordination is important to ensure that the Region is kept informed, and allow the DLPC to properly manage the IEPA's approach to shallow injection wells.

The IEPA has also agreed to allow the USEPA to deduct \$15,000 from its original FY 1991 grant allocation to give directly to the McHenry County Defenders for source identification work in McHenry County, Illinois. The Region had previously attempted to have the IEPA sponsor a source identification project in the county, however, the IEPA felt they could not commit resources toward the project at this time. The Region is proceeding with plans to sponsor this project, and will keep the IEPA informed as the project progresses.

A copy of the FY 1991 mid-year evaluation report is enclosed. In summary, the Region is encouraged by the progress made in dealing with Class I wells, and we look forward to working with the IEPA on developing a stronger compliance and enforcement program and a stronger shallow injection well program. If you have any questions or comments regarding this evaluation, please contact Laura Flynn, of my staff, at (312) 886-2929.

Sincerely yours,

Valdas V. Adamkus
Regional Administrator

Enclosure

cc: William Child, IEPA
Thomas Cavanagh, IEPA

bcc: John Taylor
George Hudak
Dave Werbach
Chad Kincheloe
Lisa Perenchio
Jerri-Anne Garl, GWPB

5WD-TUB-9 Disk/IEPA
Author: L. Flynn

Filename/IEPA-MY.91
Typist: lf final vr

Date: 07/16/91
Phone: 6-6558

[Handwritten signature] 7/19/91

5RA
10/13/91

7-19/91
7/16/91

RTW
7/19/91

[Handwritten signature]
7/16/91

103
EW
7/16

[Handwritten signature] KAR
[Handwritten signature] KAR

[Handwritten signature] 7/18

ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
UNDERGROUND INJECTION CONTROL (UIC) PROGRAM
FISCAL YEAR (FY) 1991
MID-YEAR EVALUATION

INTRODUCTION

The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) received primacy on February 1, 1984, to administer the State's Underground Injection Control (UIC) program for Class I, III, IV, and V wells. The IEPA regulates the universe of eight active Class I wells, five of which inject hazardous waste, and approximately 1,780 shallow injection wells (Class V wells) identified to date. There have been no Class III wells identified in the State and there are no known Class IV wells. Regulation of injection wells is the responsibility of the Division of Land Pollution Control (DLPC) of the IEPA.

On April 22-25, 1991, representatives from USEPA-Region V conducted the FY 1991 mid-year evaluation of IEPA's UIC program. Subsequent to the Springfield visit, Region V staff also met on May 24, 1991, with IEPA field staff at the Maywood, Illinois office. The evaluation included a review of IEPA files and discussions with IEPA staff. In-depth discussions were held concerning the implementation of a shallow injection well (Class V) program. In addition, the FY 1991 mid-year evaluation placed emphasis on the following activities:

- Program Administration
- Class I Permitting
- Land Ban Petition Review Process
- Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Actions
- Data Management

The participants in the FY 1991 mid-year evaluation are listed below.

Participants

Region V:	John Taylor George Hudak Chad Kincheloe	Laura Flynn Dave Werbach Lisa Perenchio
IEPA:	Bill Child Tom Cavanagh Jill Withers Ron Steward	Bill Radlinski Scott Phillips Glenn Savage

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Program Administration

Regulation of injection wells is the responsibility of the Division of Land Pollution Control of the IEPA. During Fiscal Year (FY) 1991, 2.2 workyears were committed to the implementation of the 1422 program in Illinois for a total budget of \$182,783. USEPA continues to support IEPA's UIC program with 75% funding.

In order to be consistent with National priorities, it was necessary for IEPA to review its available resources in light of environmental priorities for ground water protection, and shift resources to Class V for FY 1991. It is expected that most Class I land ban petition review activities in Illinois will be completed in the near future, and as a result, a decrease in Class I related work is expected which would free up existing resources to support an increased Class V effort.

Although additional Class V regulations are at least 2-1/2 years away, the National UIC program direction calls for the initiation by the Regions and States of various approaches to Class V well management through the use of existing regulations. Region V has provided information on many of these approaches, which are not resource intensive, to IEPA, and we would be more than willing to provide assistance in implementing these or similar ones should IEPA agree to do so. An in depth discussion of the IEPA's Class V activities is discussed in a separate section below.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. In order that the Class V program can become more protective of human health and the environment, protect USDWs from possible endangerment, and be consistent with National priorities, the IEPA will need to continue shifting resources to Class V activities. Although specific Class V regulations are at least 2-1/2 years away, the National UIC program direction calls for the initiation by Regions and States of various approaches to Class V well management through the use of existing regulations.

Class I Permitting

The Region remains pleased with the work done in Class I permitting and with the high level of cooperation received from IEPA in this area. To date, permit determinations have been made for all Class I wells in Illinois. IEPA regulates a universe of eight active Class I wells in Illinois. However, one of these wells, the Velsicol #2 well, is currently under authorization by rule.

During the FY 1991 Mid-Year review, Region V technical personnel examined several actions undertaken by the IEPA permitting section since the 1990 EOY review. These actions are discussed below.

Allied-Signal:

The Allied-Signal, Inc. (Allied) Class I injection well permit is due to expire this year. The IEPA is in the process of reviewing Allied's permit prior to renewal. Region V reviewers noted that the IEPA is in the process of changing the pressure testing parameters for mechanical integrity testing on this permit to make them more consistent with the other Class I permits.

Allied recently completed a mechanical integrity test (MIT) of their injection well near Danville, Illinois. USEPA reviewers noted that the well passed the pressure test under a standard of no more than a 3% pressure loss over 30 minutes. The new permit, discussed above, will require that a more strict standard of no more than 3% pressure loss over 60 minutes be met.

Allied is also requesting that their land ban petition be revised to include several new waste codes that were not included in the original petition. The USEPA will need to work closely with the IEPA in evaluating this request.

Natural Gas Pipeline (NGPL) Company:

The NGPL injection well at Herscher, Illinois, which had previously operated under authorization-by-rule, was issued a Class I nonhazardous injection well permit. NGPL is also investigating the possibility of separating their injected waste and using the injection well only for that portion of the waste that would be classified as Class II oil and gas related fluid. In this case, NGPL would need a Class II injection well permit from the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals, and the Class I permit would become void. In addition, the portion of the waste not being injected would need to be disposed of properly, and we expect that the IEPA will remain aware of this situation and inform the proper regulatory agency when necessary.

Velsicol:

The Velsicol Chemical Corporation Injection Well #2 is now being used as part of a Superfund clean-up action. The Region V UIC Section will continue to coordinate with the Region V Superfund program and with the Superfund and UIC programs at the IEPA in all matters relating to the use of this injection well. There is the possibility that the well will need a land ban petition under the UIC and Superfund regulations. Region V will continue to work with the IEPA if a Land Ban petition is required.

LTV Steel:

The LTV Steel Company groundwater monitoring (GWM) plan is nearly complete with only a few minor technical details left to be resolved. The USEPA will continue to work with the IEPA and LTV to ensure that this plan is adequate, and we expect that drilling will commence soon and that the well will be in

operation before the end of the year. As there is a requirement that the well be operational within 6 months after approval of the GWM plan, the USEPA would like to be notified by the IEPA of the exact day that the plan is approved. In addition, the USEPA will coordinate with the IEPA to ensure that all critical phases of monitoring well drilling, construction, and testing are properly witnessed.

Toxicity Characteristic (TC) Rule:

As discussed at the 1990 end-of-year review, under the new TC Rule, all hazardous and nonhazardous injection well operators in Illinois have been requested to provide an analysis of their waste to Region V and to the IEPA. Most of the well operators have now provided this data, and after all of the data has been accumulated and analyzed, Region V will work with the IEPA to decide what actions, if any, will be necessary as a result of any potential reclassification of wells under the TC rule. Any change in the status of these wells would require the IEPA to change permits and would also subject these wells to land ban requirements once the dates for TC wastes are set. We do not expect these dates to be set for several years.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. Region V is pleased with the work done by the IEPA in the area of Class I permitting, and with the high level of cooperation received from the IEPA on Class I related activities.
2. Allied's Class I injection well permit is due to expire this year. The Region notes that the IEPA is changing the pressure testing parameters for mechanical integrity testing and we view this as a positive step toward increased protection of USDWs. Allied is also requesting a revision to their land ban petition; the Region will work closely with the IEPA in evaluating this request.
3. The NGPL well has been issued a Class I nonhazardous permit, while the Velsicol #2 well continues to operate under rule authorization as part of the Superfund clean-up effort. The IEPA will need to remain aware of the status on the NGPL Class II permit request, and continue to work with the Region should a land ban petition be required at the Velsicol site.
4. The LTV GWM plan is nearly complete and the Region would like to be notified of the exact date that the plan is approved. There is a requirement that the well be operational within 6 months of the approval date of the GWM plan, and the Region will coordinate with the IEPA to ensure that all critical phases of the drilling and testing are properly witnessed.
5. Under the new TC rule, all hazardous and nonhazardous well operators in Illinois have been requested to provide analysis of their waste to Region V and the IEPA. The Region will work with the IEPA to decide what actions, if any, will be necessary as a result of any potential reclassification of wells under the TC rule.

Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Actions

The Region remains very concerned about compliance monitoring at the IEPA. During the FY 1990 EOY, Region V expressed concern that no one had been designated as lead on reviewing compliance monitoring reports and that these reports may not be properly reviewed within an adequate timeframe. The individual formerly responsible for compliance monitoring has moved to another section and is no longer responsible for monitoring Class I compliance.

Region V reviewers found that since the FY 1990 EOY, apparently only one Compliance Inquiry Letter (CIL) has been issued, and it appears that there may have been a gap in compliance monitoring since that time. During a review of the September 1990 operating report on December 27, 1990, an apparent violation was discovered. A CIL was issued on January 3, 1991, and resolved January 10, 1991.

Region V found that a new procedure for reviewing compliance has been developed, however, it has not been fully implemented to date. Under the proposed compliance monitoring system, monthly monitoring reports will be submitted by the operator to staff at the IEPA Springfield office, and to the Field Inspector at the appropriate Field office.

The reports are reviewed by the field inspector and if any non-compliances are noted, then the field staff will prepare either a Compliance Inquiry Letter (CIL) or a Pre-Enforcement Conference Letter (PECL). These letters are then submitted to the Compliance Unit in Springfield which will track the compliance of the terms of the letter.

Subsequent to the Mid-Year review, Region V reviewers contacted several representatives of the IEPA Regional Field Operations Section, and found that the procedure has not been implemented in the Springfield or Maywood Regional offices yet, and has only been used since March in the Marion office. Information was not available on implementation at the Rockford office.

The Region is very concerned that monthly monitoring reports may not be properly reviewed within an adequate timeframe, given the limited implementation of the new procedure. The Region views the proposed procedure, if implemented as planned, as having a positive impact on the protection of USDWs. However, the IEPA must begin full implementation if the IEPA is to have a comprehensive compliance monitoring program. The IEPA must ensure that until the new system is fully operational, monthly monitoring reports are being reviewed in a timely manner and that enforcement actions are taken as necessary.

Continued and/or Repeated Non-Compliance

During the FY 1990 EOY, the Region expressed concern about the IEPA's ability to handle cases of continued and/or repeated non-compliance. With only one CIL having been issued since the FY 1990 EOY review, the Region was unable to determine if this concern has been resolved. During the FY 1991 EOY review, the Region will investigate this matter further.

Administrative Order Authority

The Region was pleased with having the opportunity to comment on IEPA's Draft Administrative Order package which is before the Illinois Legislature. In absence of such authority, Region V still welcomes any IEPA referrals to the USEPA of repeat violators or other cases which the State is unable to take timely action on.

Compliance and Enforcement Strategies

Region V also discussed the need to update the IEPA compliance and enforcement strategies. Many changes have taken place since the IEPA was delegated primacy and in order to more effectively address violations with graduated, escalating enforcement responses, the IEPA needs to update their long-term compliance and enforcement strategies. The IEPA should include a discussion of FY 1992 enforcement priorities in their FY 1992 grant application and workplan.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. The Region continues to remain concerned about compliance monitoring at the IEPA. Although a new procedure for reviewing monthly monitoring reports has been developed, to date it has not been fully implemented. The IEPA must ensure that until the new system is fully operational, monthly monitoring reports are being reviewed in a timely manner and that enforcement actions are taken as necessary.
2. As only one CIL has been issued since the FY 1990 EOY, the Region was unable to determine if IEPA is now adequately addressing cases of continued and/or repeated noncompliance. During the FY 1991 EOY review, the Region will investigate this matter further.
3. The Region was pleased with the opportunity to comment on IEPA's Draft Administrative Order package. In the absence of such authority, Region V welcomes any IEPA referrals of repeat violators or other cases which the State is unable to take timely action on.
4. The IEPA should proceed to update their compliance and enforcement strategies, and submit them with the FY 1992 grant application and workplan.

DATA MANAGEMENT

Compliance of Class I facilities is hand-tracked on forms, rather than on a computer system, by the Compliance Tracking Unit of the Planning and Reporting Section. Because of the absence of a significant number of UIC wells, the Compliance Tracking Unit stated it was unlikely a computer system will be utilized.

The UIC filing system continues to show improvement. However, some compliance related documents still appear to be misfiled. In the Cabot UIC compliance file, a response from Cabot to a CIL, dated 10/26/90, and a letter from IEPA to Cabot, dated 11/30/90, stating that the violation had been resolved were present, but the CIL that was issued on 10/17/90 was not in the file. IEPA staff stated that most likely the missing document was placed in a general compliance file, as opposed to the UIC compliance file, and agreed to look into the matter. The Region suggests that IEPA continue to work on their Class I filing system and ensure that UIC related documents are filed in the appropriate files. Reviewers also noted a backlog of documents waiting to be screened and filed. The IEPA must ensure that these documents are also screened and filed in the appropriate files in a timely manner.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. Region V suggests that the IEPA work on their Class I filing system. While the system continues to show improvement, some compliance related documents appear to be misfiled. The IEPA should also work to screen and file all documents in a timely manner so that backlogs of unscreened documents do not occur.

Class V Program

The original FY 1991 grant application provided for only 0.2 workyears in the Class V program. After considerable negotiation between the IEPA and Region V, the IEPA submitted an approvable grant application in March 1991, which increased the level of effort in this area to 0.86 workyears. While the Regional strongly supports the increased effort in the FY 1991 Class V program, the IEPA must consider shifting even greater resources toward the Class V effort. Although the FY 1991 workplan provided for an increase in Class V workyears over that included in previous fiscal years, even greater involvement by IEPA staff is recommended in future fiscal years so that the Class V program can become more protective of human health and the environment, protect USDWs from possible endangerment, and be consistent with National priorities.

Proposed activities for FY 1991, include the development of an instructional video on Service Station Bay (5X28) wells, inspections of the 5X28 wells on the State inventory, and updating the Class V inventory with any Class V wells found within "setback zones" by the Division of Public Water Supplies.

Because the FY 1991 grant was not issued until April 23, 1991, many of the proposed activities had not been implemented as of the FY 1991 mid-year review. These activities will be reviewed in detail during the FY 1991 end-of-year (EOY). The proposed Class V activities and their current status is discussed below.

Class V Coordination

During previous reviews, Region V expressed concern about the lack of coordination of Class V activities among the various Divisions at the IEPA. During FY 1990 the IEPA agreed to designate a Class V Coordinator to act as the point of contact for statewide Class V activities. The Coordinator is responsible for reporting to the Region all Class V activities conducted by the Division of Land Pollution Control (DLPC), including activities conducted by Field staff, as well as by the Division of Public Water Supplies (DPWS) and the Division of Water Pollution Control (DWPC).

Subsequent to the FY 1990 Mid-Year review, the Region found a number of Class V activities that have taken place but were not documented on either the quarterly reporting forms, or included in the annual Class V ad hoc report to the Region. One field office reported inspecting "at least four, maybe as many as 10" Class V facilities in the last few years, while a total of only 3 Class V inspections for the entire State have been reported on the quarterly reporting forms since 1987.

Even if inspections are funded by a program other than the UIC program, DPWS or DWPC for example, the IEPA DLPC should still report these activities to the Region. Coordination should be maintained throughout the year so that all appropriate activities can be included in the quarterly reports and the annual Class V ad hoc report. While this coordination is important to ensure that Region V is kept informed, it is also needed to allow the DLPC to properly manage the IEPA's approach to shallow injection wells.

Class V Wells Within "Setback Zones" and Update on Streator Wells

In the FY 1991 grant application, the IEPA stated it will update its inventory of Class V wells with any Class V wells discovered within "setback zones" by the Division of Public Water Supplies under its State funded groundwater protection program. The IEPA will also continue to investigate any complaints received, address any Class V wells located within setback zones, provide USEPA with an update on Streator Class V wells semiannually, and, as necessary, consult with the Illinois Department of Public Health on Class V wells.

During FY 1991, no additional Class V wells were identified within "setback zones." The DLPC should continue to maintain contact with the DPWS and report any updates on these wells to the Region. Also, to date, the IEPA has not provided the Region with the semiannual update on Streator Class V wells as committed to in the FY 1991 grant. The IEPA should prepare a status update on the Class V wells in Streator and forward it to the Region.

Investigation of 5X28 Wells

The IEPA agreed to inspect the 5X28 Class V wells that are a part of its inventory list as well as any 5X28 candidates selected from USEPA's National Enforcement Investigation Center's inventory list. The IEPA inspection, sampling/analysis, and enforcement activity will continue as long as the USEPA grant funds plus IEPA match funds are available for this task.

So far in FY 1991, no inspections of Class V wells have been documented by the IEPA. Any inspections which take place during the second half of the year will be reviewed during the FY 1991 EOY review.

Public Education/Pollution Prevention

The IEPA will have an instructional video tape (10-15 minutes) produced on Class V injection wells for the petroleum industry in Illinois. This tape will be used by the petroleum industry as an educational tool for customers and agents to indicate the correct and legal disposal of station wastes at both rural and urban service station facilities. A tentative deadline of July 1, 1991, was set for completion of the video script. The Region would like the opportunity to review the script before the video is produced to ensure that all information included is consistent with the National Administrative Order (AO) addressing 5X28 service station bay wells. The Region will also provide technical assistance to the IEPA, if requested, in developing the video.

McHenry County Source ID Project

The IEPA agreed to allow USEPA to deduct \$15,000 from its original FY 1991 UIC grant allocation to give directly to the McHenry County Defenders for source identification work in McHenry County, Illinois. The Region had previously attempted to have the IEPA sponsor a source identification (ID) project in the county, however, the IEPA felt they could not commit resources toward the project at this time. The IEPA requested to be kept informed of this joint USEPA/McHenry County Defenders effort.

Region V representatives met recently with representatives from the City of Crystal Lake, McHenry County Department of Public Health and the McHenry County Defenders (Defenders) to discuss the possibility of conducting a Source ID inventory project in Crystal Lake, Illinois. The McHenry County Public Health Department fully supports the inventory effort and has agreed to work with any communities in the county to implement the project. Representatives from the City of Crystal Lake are currently evaluating the capability of their community to implement such a project.

If funded, the project will be coordinated jointly by city and county officials, while utilizing volunteers from the Defenders to conduct the actual inventory. The project is based on a similar project currently underway in Elkhart, Indiana. The Defenders are especially concerned with the impact stormwater drainage (5D2) wells may have on groundwater in the area, as well as the impact of industrial drainage (5W20) wells and service station bay (5X28) wells. Any inventory of 5X28 wells will be forwarded to the Region for possible inclusion in the National Initiative to close all service station bay wells. A copy of the inventory will also be forwarded to the IEPA for inclusion in their Class V inventory.

Recommendations and Conclusions

1. The Region strongly supports the IEPA increase in Class V related activities for FY 1991, and we encourage the IEPA to continue this trend. The National UIC program is shifting toward an increased Class V program and the IEPA will need to consider increasing the level of effort in this area even more to remain consistent with the National effort.
2. The IEPA needs to ensure that all Class V activities, whether funded through the UIC program or not, are properly documented in the quarterly reporting forms, as well as in the annual Class V ad hoc report. It appears that a number of Class V activities are taking place, and not being reported by the Division of Land Pollution Control (DLPC), in both the Division of Public Water Supplies (DPWS) and the Division of Water Pollution Control, as well as through the DLPC Field Offices.
3. The DLPC should continue to coordinate with the DPWS to ensure that DLPC inventory is updated to include any wells identified within "setback zones" by the DPWS. Also, to date, the IEPA has not provided the Region with the semiannual update on Streator Class V wells as committed to in the FY 1991 grant. The IEPA should prepare a status update on the Class V wells in Streator and forward it to the Region.
4. The IEPA has agreed to inspect the 5X28 wells which are part of its inventory list as well as any candidates selected from USEPA's National Enforcement Investigation Center's inventory list. No inspections have yet been documented during FY 1991. Any inspections which occur in the second half of the Fiscal Year will be reviewed during the FY 1991 EOY review.
5. The IEPA will have an instructional video produced on correct and legal disposal of service station waste for use by the petroleum industry in Illinois. A tentative deadline has been set of July 1, 1991 for completion of the script. The Region would like the opportunity to comment on the proposed script before the video is produced to ensure that all information included is consistent with the National Administrative Order (AO) effort addressing service station bay (5X28) wells.
6. Region V is proceeding with plans to sponsor a source identification project in McHenry County, Illinois, with the assistance of the McHenry County Public Health Department and the McHenry County Defenders. The City of Crystal Lake has been working with the Region, and may participate in the project, as well. The Region will keep the IEPA informed as to the status of this project as it progresses.